

Citation for published version:

Silk, ML & Andrews, DL 2011, '(Re)Presenting Baltimore: Place, Policy, Politics, and Cultural Pedagogy', *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 433-464.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.620865>

DOI:

[10.1080/10714413.2011.620865](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.620865)

Publication date:

2011

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.620865)

This is an electronic version of an article published in Silk, M. L. and Andrews, D. L., 2011. (Re)Presenting Baltimore: Place, Policy, Politics, and Cultural Pedagogy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33 (5), pp. 433-464. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.620865>

University of Bath

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

(Re)Presenting Baltimore: Place, Policy, Politics & Cultural Pedagogy

Michael L. Silk & David L. Andrews

Paper Submitted to Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies

July 30, 2010

Revised and Resubmitted 2nd August, 2011

Please direct all correspondence to:

Michael Silk
Department of Education
Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences
University of Bath
Bath
BA2 7AY
England

Email: m.silk@bath.ac.uk

Declaration: This article has not been published elsewhere and that it has not been submitted simultaneously for publication elsewhere

Author Bios:

Michael L. Silk is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Education at the University of Bath. His research and scholarship centres on the relationships between urban space, the governance of bodies, (physical) cultural pedagogies, and, identity politics within the context of neo-liberalism.

David L. Andrews is a Professor in the Physical Cultural Studies Program at the University of Maryland. Informed by the theories, methods, and politics of contemporary cultural studies, Dr. Andrews's teaching and research interests are prefigured on a critical understanding of physical cultural forms as fluid and relational spaces within, and through, which particular understandings of the social order and social subjectivity become authorized and/or contested.

(Re)Presenting Baltimore: Place, Policy, Politics & Cultural Pedagogy

In many ways, it [*Baltimore*] is emblematic of the processes that have moulded cities under US capitalism, offering a laboratory sample of contemporary urbanism. But, of course, it has its own distinctive character as well. (Harvey 2001, 7)

While acknowledging its inveterate quirkiness, the noted cultural geographer David Harvey (1973; 1989; 2000; 2001; 2007) has spent much of his career explicating the degree to which Baltimore is a city redolent of the conditions, forces, and constraints that have shaped the structure and experience of life within the late capitalist metropolis. Following Harvey, our intent is to explicate—through the empirical context of Baltimore—the cultural praxis, politics, and pedagogies associated with the emergence of cities as cultural sites, spaces and indeed mechanisms, of public governance. As a city ‘begging for interpretation’ (Soja 1989)—in that it is a ‘capital space’ imbued with power relations—we are most interested in how the very governance of Baltimore has come to incorporate the mobilization of powerful cultural pedagogies, symbolic place-promotions, and accompanying ‘internal’ public policy initiatives, that discursively constitute both subjects of, and subjects to, relations of power (Giroux 2001a; Giroux & Giroux 2006). That is, in the tradition of Giroux (1994; 2000a; 2000b; 2001a; 2001b; 2003; 2004a; 2004b; 2004c), Kellner (1995) and others (e.g Barrett 2006; Costa 2004; Couldry 2008) who point to the importance of culture and the culture industries (and the public and popular discourses they produce) in the shaping, molding and education of citizens, we see Baltimore’s symbolic place-promotions and place ‘management’ strategies, as impactful public and pedagogical discourses that seductively convey values, knowledges, and power relations. Further, as evidenced within the Baltimore context, that these cultural pedagogies are spatialized—that is, that they ‘belong’ to seemingly perceptible, and indeed knowable, socio-spatial environments and relations—generates viscerally affective and effective processes of subject formation through pedagogical relations and practices.

Thus, we turn to Baltimore, in order to explicate the discursive reproduction and repositioning of the contemporary city. Our aim is to build upon recent work focused on the reformation of the late capitalist metropolitan space as an arena for culturally-propelled growth and elite consumption practices, including those linked to: place marketing and tourism; enterprise and empowerment zones; local tax abatements; urban development corporations; public-private partnerships; and, property-redevelopment schemes (see e.g. Bockmeyer 2000; Brenner and Theodore 2002a/b; Davies, 1990; Harvey 2001; Judd and Simpson 2003; Peck and Tickell 2002; Sheller and Urry 2003; Silk 2004; 2007; Silk and Andrews 2006; 2008; Walks 2001). More specifically, we center on Baltimore's local policy initiatives, popular representations and place promotions—those that are eminently more symbolic and rhetorical than material and concrete—that we propose seduce citizens/consumers/tourists to a specific order of things, educating various constituencies of people regarding their behavior within, and expectations of, particular cityspaces. We argue that public policy (and the various co-articulations with other representations of the city), vis-a-vis its role as a form and agent of cultural pedagogy (in the form of campaigns discursively constituted for the citizenry and externally focused tourist-rhetoric), operates to bifurcate urban spaces and populations, creating stark distinctions between bodies that *do* and *do not* matter (Butler 1993; Zylinska 2004): between the generative affluent and the degenerative poor; between the private (tourist) consumer and the public recipient; between the civic stimulant and the civic detriment; and, between the socially valorized and the socially pathologized (Silk and Andrews 2006; 2008). Our focus is on highly public, pedagogic and seductive discursive formations; as such we point to and expose the power relations inherent within discourse. While the focus of this paper maps out discursive power relations, how such discursive formations articulate, and are actualized within, lived experiences is beyond the scope of this project. However, we should be clear that the actualization of such policies/discursive formations—in terms of how they become instantiated in ways that control, manage and govern citizens—has underpinned our previous work (see Andrews, Silk & Pitter, 2008; Silk, 2007; Silk, 2009; Silk, 2010; Silk & Andrews, 2008), and thus informs the argument we develop

herein. Further, our current, co-participatory scholarship in certain pockets of Baltimore builds upon this argument, as we work with those discursively constituted as ‘anti-citizens’ to reshape urban, public and health-related policies. As such, in interrogating the very public, highly educative, cultural pedagogies inherent in Baltimore’s place promotion and place management, our argument points to a ‘lean and mean’ (Smith 1998) urban cultural geography, and illuminates the brutalizing injustices resulting from the advancement of profoundly ‘divisive social geographies’ (incorporating interdependent social, spatial and pedagogical dimensions) within contemporary urban formations (MacLeod 2002). Prior to explicating the (often competing) symbolic place promotion strategies, popular representations and internal initiatives designed to bolster and secure market logics, we offer a brief account of the (re)constitution of neoliberal urban glamour zones, so redolent of the Baltimore experience.

Neoliberal Glamour Zones: Material & Symbolic (Re)Constitution of Place

Without wishing to circumvent the acknowledged complexities of 19th century urbanization and industrialization, and the subsequent corollaries of 20th century deindustrialization, population decline and suburbanization (see e.g. Gottdiener 1994; 2000), for the purposes of brevity, we centre on the new urban morphology (more closely aligned with the symbolic regimes of production and consumption underpinning the late capitalist economy [Jameson 1991]) adopted by many Western cities from the 1970s onwards. The breaking down of the post-war national political consensus, the rolling back of the Keynesian welfare state, the emergence of post-Fordist patterns of production and consumption (e.g. MacLeod, Raco and Ward 2003; Walks 2001), compounded by the problems of deindustrialization, a falling tax base due to suburban flight, and, the associated concentration of impoverished residents in inner areas (Brenner and Theodore 2002b; Goodwin, 1993), has meant—faithfully evoking the political hegemony of neoliberal ideologies and policies—urban governments have sought to (re)capitalize upon the cultural landscapes of their cities (Brenner and Theodore 2002b; MacLeod 2002; Peck 2003; Peck and Tickell 2002).

Our position constitutes a response to the populist political ideology and praxis graphically explicated within Giroux's (2000a; 2003; 2004a) re-appropriation of the post-structuralist leitmotif pertaining to the *death of the social*. This is characterized by a virulent contempt for the very notion of social welfare provision, an equally pernicious and questioning attitude towards those who are its recipients, and, an individualizing culture of surveillance, accountability, and resentment. Our argument develops the notion that the scrubbed and reinvented spaces of consumption are often specially-designed, sanitized, sterile, entertainment districts concentrated in small areas—physically bounded “tourist bubbles” (Judd 1999, 53)—that cordon off and cosset the desired visitor, as they simultaneously ward off the threatening ‘native’ (Fainstein and Gladstone, 1999; Harvey 2001; Jamieson 2004; Lash and Urry 1994; Silk 2004; 2007; 2010). These ‘spectacular spaces of consumption’ (Belanger 2000) are predicated on the development of commercial leisure environments: shopping malls, themed restaurants, bars, theme parks, mega-complexes for professional sport franchises, gentrified housing, conference complexes, and, waterfront pleasure domes (Gottdiener 2000; Macleod et al 2003; Waitt, 1999; Wilcox & Andrews 2003). As such, the ‘presentation’ or staging of a commercially reconstituted and spectacularized downtown—what de Certeau (1984) terms a ‘concept city’—may well work to negate preconceived urban experiences, yet, this is merely a sophisticated façade (Harvey 2001) that belies the structural inequalities in the contemporary cityscape, routinely manifest in polarized labour markets, extreme economic disparities, and racially differentiated housing, population distribution, schooling, and welfare provision. Such structural inequalities are clearly embedded within the social, material and symbolic fabric of Baltimore city, yet which are equally submerged beneath the cities (literally and figuratively) spectacularized frontage. While there have been long histories that detail the decline of manufacturing in Baltimore, the segregated school system and the increased poverty among African-Americans in the city (three times higher than the state average) (see Quirk & Binder, 2006), it is the publication of the 2010 Baltimore City Health Disparities Report Card that most markedly points towards the actualization of structural inequalities in distinct Baltimore neighbourhoods (available at:

http://www.baltimorehealth.org/info/2010_05_25_HDR-FINAL.pdf). The report details the health inequities—the result of systematic social, political, economic, and environmental policies and practices—driven by differences in residents access to opportunities that promote and enhance health and points to a variety of social determinants of health (e.g. access to healthy food, healthy housing, healthcare, safe neighborhoods, education and employment opportunities, and transportation). Utilizing a number of disparity ratios (such as age, gender, education, income and location) the report offers a gruesome testament to deeply engrained, and socially and economically divisive operations of racial containment within the city: African American men for example are more than twice as likely than white men to suffer from prostate cancer, African Americans are eight times more likely to contract HIV/AIDs than whites in the city, over three times more likely to live in a ‘dangerous’ neighborhood, twice as likely to be obese, suffer from high blood pressure or diabetes, have no healthcare and report food insecurity (concern about having enough food), five times more likely to have childhood asthma three and half times more likely to have unmet mental healthcare needs, and, African American men are 11.5 times more likely to be the victims of homicide than white males. Therefore, and perhaps as the nefarious counter to neoliberal urban policy regimes (deregulation, privatization, liberalization, enhanced fiscal austerity, symbolically oriented tourist economies), it is important to think of cityspace as polarized or segregated, creating a divided city: a container of multiple narratives within the context of transformations in the predominant mode of social regulation (Walks 2001). For, as is clear, and as with many expressions of neoliberalism, the new urban glamour zones—upon which many cities have based their economic revival—conceal a brutalizing demarcation between winner and losers, included and excluded, lionized and demonized populations (MacLeod 2002); crude binary distinctions between those included in social, political and cultural practices and those excluded, and, in which the poor or degenerate are rigidly disciplined through a range of discursive, legal, and, architectural methods (MacLeod et. al. 2003; Smith 1998).

The ‘visually seductive’ celebration of the commercial monumentalities of late capitalism—which elevates the culture industries to new heights—interrupts the perception of the inner city as an unsafe area of unchecked blight, racial strife, criminality and deviance (Friedman, Andrews and Silk 2004; Judd and Simpson, 2003). Indeed, within this neoliberal conjuncture, city leaders must ensure that very real material problems are dealt with by “changing perceptions about the relative costs and benefits of city living” (Gibson 2005, 260). That is, the ‘solution’ to urban inequality, decay, and, social and racialized containment is *symbolic*. As Gibson (2005, 260) points out, contemporary urban studies has begun to address questions that are discursive and symbolic; “if a major problem facing US urban leaders is the circulation of negative images about the city, then, according to this logic the solution is, therefore, symbolic as well. The city’s brand needs to be repositioned.” We might add to Gibson (2005), that such discourses are, extremely public, potent, pedagogic and political, serving as an economy of affect through which positions of power and privilege are normalized and thereby (re)produced. Further, this also points to the increased role of culture and the cultural industries in disseminating cultural pedagogies that educate citizens/tourists/consumers with respect to “how to behave and what to think, feel, believe, fear and desire—and what not to” (Kellner 1995, 2) within certain spaces. There is then a greater importance attached to promoting the positive, unique and differential amenity and service attributes of a city, and thus the symbolic strategies and campaigns flaunted by the mavens of the culture industries (e.g. *What happens in Vegas, Stays in Vegas*). In an effort to adopt an entrepreneurial stance to attract mobile global capital, ‘urban imagineering’ or efforts at image creation—representations of a reality (Pagano and Browman 1995), no matter how false and/or disingenuous—are often employed by an amalgam of private/public constitutions (see Sheller and Urry, 2003) to reinforce existing positive images, neutralize and change unfavorable ones and to create new images where few or no images exist (Haider 1992). These symbolic strategies often require a redefinition of the place identity of the city in the imaginary of external audiences—made up of prospective investors, (corporate) tourists and consumers (Rowe and McGuirk 1999)—

and are deployed by civic administrations as part of an armory in a symbolic struggle against the amorphous enemy: the material experiences and crushing symbolism of urban decay (Gibson 2005).

Contextualising Baltimore

Baltimore has been credited with having undergone a ‘model’ urban renaissance; the London *Sunday Times* proclaiming in 1987 that “the decay of old Baltimore slowed, halted, then turned back” (Harvey 2001; Hula 1990; Wagner 1996). Initial redevelopment of the Central Business District started in the late 1950s and early 1960s with the \$180 million Charles Center office and retail complex, which was targeted towards white-collar professional corporations in the legal, finance, insurance, and real estate industries (Harvey 2001; Hula 1990; Wagner 1996). Business leaders then turned their focus toward the Inner Harbour, which had been a ‘cradle’ of the city’s development and long been a centre for Baltimore’s industrial, warehousing and wholesaling activities, but had fallen into disuse and decay by 1960 and was characterized as an area of urban blight (Wagner 1996). Following the election of Mayor William Donald Schaefer in 1971—whose campaign and administration focused on the redevelopment of the urban core (Hula 1990)—the Inner Harbor was gradually transformed into a space predicated on consumption. The berthing of the U.S.S. Constellation, an early 19th century U.S. Navy ship, in 1972, the relocation of the Baltimore City Fair, attended by 2 million people, to the Inner Harbour in 1973, the completion of the Maryland Science Centre (1974), and, the 27-story World Trade Center (1977) offered early momentum (Friedman et. al. 2004; Hula 1990; Silk & Amis 2005; Wagner 1996).

Overcoming opposition from citizens who wanted to preserve the waterfront for public use, subsequent developments formed the Inner Harbour’s flagship projects: the Harborplace festival mall, the redevelopment of the former Baltimore city power plant that now houses the *ESPN zone*, the *Hard Rock café*, *Golds Gym*, and *Barnes and Noble*, the National Aquarium, the Hyatt Regency Hotel, and, the Baltimore Convention Centre (Harvey 2001; Wagner 1996). With the backbone of the Harbor’s new infrastructure in place, the Baltimore Strategic Management Committee announced a 20 year renaissance strategy for downtown as “a place for people”, a place of “opportunity”,

“uncommonly liveable”, “easy to get to” and “especially attractive” for residents and tourists to consume from a diverse array of leisure options offered around Baltimore’s Inner Harbour (in Friedman et. al. 2004). Encouraged by public-private partnerships and federal initiatives (e.g. Empowerment Zone and Renewal Community designation), Baltimore’s resuscitation has been ground in a turn to the cultural economy—leisure, tourism, entertainment and culture (Allon 2004; Cohen 1999; Judd and Simpson, 2003)—that has attracted the “creative class” (Florida 2002), tourists, and international media attention to the city’s once moribund central business district (CBD). This reputation was bolstered by *Frommers* in 2005 who touted Baltimore as one of the top 10 up and coming tourist destinations in the world (see Silk & Andrews 2006).

The last twenty years has seen Baltimore’s tourist bubble (Judd 1999) expand east (into the Fells Point and Canton neighborhoods that border the Inner Harbor) and west along the Pratt Street corridor (anchored by the *Camden Yards* ballpark, the *Mc&T Bank* Stadium [home of the NFL franchise, the *Baltimore Ravens*], the *Hippodrome Theatre*, the new *Centerpoint* and *Zenith* retail complexes, under the auspicious slogan, “*The West has Zest*”). Building on *Frommers* proclamation in 2005, the reputation of Baltimore’s tourist bubble as a space of play was furthered recently through hosting a leg of the Volvo Ocean Round the World yacht race (which re-energized the Inner Harbor as a place for ships—there had previously been calls to remove certain ships from the harbor area given their ‘disturbing’ physical presence obstructs the view of the monumentalities of consumption, such as the ESPN Zone, upon which the Harbor’s new economy is based (see Gunts 2006)). The symbolic accoutrement to such material transformations comes in the form of evocative discursive efforts to reposition the urban ‘brand.’

The Symbolic Repositioning of Place: Culture, Policy, Pedagogy & Politics

With Giroux (2004c, 497), our boundaries for comprehending the pedagogic and political significance of popular discourse, have shifted (the result of the organizing force of a neoliberal ideology); the mechanisms by which we come to engage and understand particular discourses are

now, perhaps more than ever, formulated upon the capability and ubiquity of certain (consumptive) discourses to construct “knowledge, values, and identities.” That is, in our neoliberal present, which offers an array of popular (commodified) practices and technologies (advertising, marketing, consumption, television, gaming and so on) for the shaping of civility, social solidarity, and social responsibility and the assemblage, or indeed display, of the normalized, regulated, subject (Rose 1999; 2000), popular cultural discourses act as very normalising public pedagogies, educating us about belonging, being, other, us, them. In this regard, culture has become eminently pedagogic and pedagogy eminently cultural; the symbolic strategizing of civic administrations providing seductive cultural pedagogies that position and shape citizens and external audiences, directing their ‘behavior in space’ towards certain ends.

Baltimore has a somewhat checkered history with such illusory place-marketing discourses. Predated by ‘Charm City’ and the ‘The City that Reads’ (which was cynically redubbed the City that Bleeds, due to the cities staggering homicide rate), former Baltimore Mayor Martin O’Malley branded Baltimore in election sloganeering: ‘The Greatest City in America.’ Indeed, despite having the dubious honor of being ranked among the highest in the US in murder rates, drug-addiction, syphilis, gonorrhea, and, H.I.V infection rates (Dao 2005; Kurson 2002), a recent and contrived allusion to the “health” of Baltimore came in the January 2006 issue of *Men’s Fitness*, in which the magazine named Baltimore as the “Fittest City in America” (see Silk & Andrews 2006). Such commercially constructed rhetoric, points to a collective affinity—a triumphal paeon if you like—to the ‘logics’ of neoliberalism and thus compliments ‘official’ city orchestrated campaigns centered on morphing the power of the new economy into an increasingly urban phenomenon (O’Malley 2000). Fully ground in the shift of power from democratic local governing regimes to semi-autonomous, fragmented, public/private authorities that operate largely independently from democracy and with little public accountability (Judd and Simpson 2003), then Baltimore Mayor Martin O’Malley made no secret of his intentions to assuage corporate support for the continued urban regeneration of Baltimore. In true neoliberal fashion, and reminiscent of wider democratic shifts away from the welfare capitalism

of a previous generation, O'Malley (2000 emphasis added) clearly outlined the direction of his administration:

Not too long ago, big city mayors had to spend a great deal of time being social workers; now mayors also have to be entrepreneurs . . . a mayor's job has changed from generating government-run programs for every problem, to *producing deals* and *partnerships* that deliver measurable improvements.

Indeed, in a direct attempt to actuate the city as a competitive location for hi-technology firms (Bonitz 2003), O'Malley (2000) metaphorically converted the mercantile waterways to a series of 'electronic currents' under the *Digital Harbor* brand name. Fully complicit with the *Digital Harbor* moniker, the Baltimore City Planning Commission unveiled its seven-year comprehensive master plan in May 2006. The report, titled, "Live. Earn. Learn. Play: A Business Plan for a World Class City, 2007-2012" was eight years in the making and was adopted by the Baltimore City Council in September 2006.

The master plan is, in many respects, a blueprint for the material imposition of market logics onto the city given its focus on, to offer just a few examples, the safety of neighborhoods, the attraction of desired residents to the city, the encouragement of entrepreneurship, the concentration of earning in health, biosciences, hi-technology industries, hospitality, and tourism, and, most importantly for our present purposes, the cultural economy of the city. Perhaps not surprisingly, the *Play* section of the report centers on tying together tourism, heritage, nightlife, and sport as the fabric of a healthy "24-hour world-class city" (Baltimore City Planning Commission 2006, 8). Keen to build upon the 15.7 million visitors and business travelers the city attracted in 2004 and their \$2.9 billion spend, the plan emphasizes capitalizing upon Baltimore's uniqueness, visual arts, music, histories, theater, nightlife districts, entertainment and sports through major promotional campaigns in target tourist markets. Thus, as a component of the comprehensive master plan, the latest layer of urban imagineering was conceived. The plan gives elevated responsibility and funding to the Baltimore Area Convention and Visitors Association (BACVA), suggesting the return, increased tourist dollars,

would outweigh the costs. As such, and in a turn to the symbolic dimensions of urban development, in late 2005 the city paid \$500,000 to Landor Associates—famed for building brands for Madrid, the State of Florida, Hong Kong, Gatorade, Altoids, Fed Ex, and, Kentucky Fried Chicken—to create a slogan for the city (Donovan 2005).

The brand image, “destination re-positioning” as it is labeled by Landor, sets out to draw on the ‘critical points of difference’, the uniqueness and peculiarities of the city (Landor Associates Report to Baltimore City Council 2005 in Donovan, 2005). These particularities of place not surprisingly include the waterfront and capture the constructions and constructedness of the “genuine” character of Baltimoreans—a character centered on the ‘quirky’, ‘funky’, ‘off-kilter’, ‘hilarious’ ‘bizarre’, ‘off-center attitude’—labeled in the report as the ‘Hon factor.’ The ‘Hon factor’, rooted in Baltimore’s working class white communities—whiteness, once again, rendered as ‘genuine’ and ‘authentic’—is perhaps best captured in the works of city resident John Waters (Silk & Andrews 2006). Perhaps best known for the 1988 movie, *Hairspray*, now a major Broadway success and subsequently remade in 2007, Walter’s own off-beat and eccentric version of Baltimore constructs a particular, and admittedly stylized, symbolic rendering of the city: a rendering annually ‘performed’ each year at the Baltimore Hon festival, commemorated daily in the Hampden neighborhood’s Café Hon diner, and in Eight Stone Press’s ‘Smile Hon You’re in Baltimore’ Series (and Facebook page), or indeed the satirical observations of growing up in Baltimore in David Belz’s collection of essays, stories and poems ‘White Asparagus.’¹

In May 2006, coinciding with the launch of the city’s master plan, BACVA unveiled the new symbolic tagline: ‘*Get in on it.*’ By May 2010, this tagline had been replaced by another \$500,000 slogan ‘*Bmore Happy*’ which, rather ironically, is based on research that suggests, in a time of economic downturn, people are embracing simpler things that make them laugh and smile (Donnell 2010; Gunts 2010). The brand platform (and resulting slogans) is centered on Baltimore’s ‘central gathering spot’: the Inner Harbor (Landor 2006), the space (or stage in the promotional vernacular) from which visitors can explore Baltimore’s arts, culture, food, history, neighborhoods, and of

course, sports (Visit Baltimore 2006). Based on a nine month research exercise incorporating mail out surveys, one-on-one management interviews with key stakeholders and community partners, and, focus groups in feeder markets (Washington, D.C, Philadelphia, and Northern New Jersey) research and visitor profiling conducted by tourism research consultancy Longwoods International, Landor built upon the ‘uniqueness’ of Baltimore as a quirky, laid back city that is ‘very rich in that which it has to offer.’ The connotative value of the brand is built upon a ‘colorful visual identity’ that communicates a city on water and uses icons to represent the ‘fun, carefree and spontaneous’ nature of the city: baseball at Camden Yards; nightlife and entertainment at Fells Point; dining on crabs; and visiting the Science Center and Aquarium (Landor 2006). Aimed at tourists, convention and meeting planners, the new brand is communicated via a series of promotions including print, radio and web campaigns, public relations, downtown promotions, and most markedly, a television commercial (to be shown in external markets) featuring local residents enjoying the arts, sports, food, and culture of the Inner Harbor. Other neighborhoods that speak to the particularities of the cities cultures and histories are also represented (although the focus is very much centered on the Inner Harbor) in the strategizing (such as Hampden, location of the Café Hon diner and the annual Hon Fest), yet, interestingly, the city’s own comprehensive master plan suggests that it is difficult to draw tourists away from the Inner Harbor and to other neighborhoods due to the lack of transportation, signage, and, safety concerns outside the cosseted tourist bubble.

Contested Cultural Pedagogies: *Popular* Representations of Place

Get in on It / Bmore Happy stand in stark contrast to perceptions of the city that offer less friendly, although significantly less expensive, labels—The Heroin Capital, the Murder Capital—that focus on the perception of the city as ‘hopeless, depressed, unemployed and crack addicted’ (Landor Associates Report to Baltimore City Council 2005, in Donovan 2005). Such labels draw on stark statistics and, when taken into account alongside the Health Disparities Report alluded to earlier, offer a frightening picture: 24% of the city’s residents live in poverty (compared with 14% nationally)

as Baltimore's per capita income level fell to 57% of Maryland's average (Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies, 2000), life expectancies are 14 years under national averages, teen pregnancy was the highest among the nation's 50 largest cities in 1999, and, 34% of children under 18 in the city live below the poverty level (nationally, this figure is 10%) (Hagerty and Dunham 2005; Harvey 2000; Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies 2000; Siegel & Smith 2001; Silk and Andrews 2006; US Census Bureau 2004). Homicide rates in the city average around 300 per year (around seven times higher than the national rate, six times higher than New York city, and three times higher than Los Angeles) in the last decade—the majority of homicides are endemic to drug and gang related violence (Dao 2005). Furthermore, large parcels of the city are characterized by block after block of vacant row houses, the city has led the nation in violent crime, juvenile homicide, heroin, cocaine, and syphilis rates, and, a higher percentage of the city's population tested positive for heroin than in any other U.S. city, with some 59,000 addicts in a city of 675,000, nearly one in 10 of the population (Cannon 1999). Put simply, and although there have been recent fluctuations in murder rates (although at the time of writing in 2010, Baltimore again had the highest murder rate in the United States) and violent crime, Baltimore is, as with many cities whose civic administration operates less in the interests of citizens, and more in the interests of bolstering the 'logics' of the marketplace (see e.g. Sheller and Urry 2003), the "home of the comfortable and the prison of the choice-less" (Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies 2000, 48).

Juxtaposed with the commercial monumentalities of the tourist bubble and the symbolic and discursive repositioning of the city through destination repositioning, these haunting realities are the fodder of popular mediations of the city: Baltimore has provided the evocative locations for the television series *Homicide: Life on the Street*, *The Wire*, and *The Corner* that focus upon the drug- and murder-cultures of the cityⁱⁱⁱ. Performer Jay-Z has rapped about taking cocaine to Baltimore for sale, while 50 Cent has offered a drug serenade to the city titled "A Baltimore Love Thing" on his album *The Massacre*, (Ollison & Kiehl 2005). The city is also the setting for an action/horror video game titled *The Suffering: Ties that Bind*. Produced by Surreal Software, the game was designed after a team

from the company visited the city to ‘search out the horror along the industrial waterfront and in neighborhoods like Druid Hill Park’ (Tucker 2005, 1E). Indeed, as the game itself announces, ‘the familiar streets of Baltimore are stained with the blood of the suffering.’ The basic narrative follows Torque, a white, tank-top clad anti-hero, from his escaping a Chesapeake Bay prison to Baltimore where he searches for the spot in where his wife and children were murdered. Along the way, our ‘hero’ battles monsters that embody drug use (a hunchback with syringes for eyes) and hunger, brutally murders police officers, and, encounters an array of other ‘degenerates’ (including half man/beasts and ‘deviants’ with swords for legs, who, while not always depicted as black per se, in comparison to the ‘hero’, stand as the abject, disposable, non-whites and are all based on various forms of human atrocities). The Baltimore depicted in the game includes toppled and burnt out rowhouses, bare light bulbs, burning trash cans, a crack house, sawn off shot-guns, rusty pipes, baseball bats, and, Molotov cocktails. As player, you control Torque’s movements, and are rewarded for taking an evil path through this horrific world. (Un)Fortunately, our skill level on the X-box prevents us from explaining any more about this game, from detailing the mutant crabs, the Spawn pit, the gaggle of mad scientists, or the cat-sized sewer system rats, needless to say, albeit with artistic license in the form of an L-train and a retro Baltimore basketball jersey, the game offers a digitized version of the Baltimore we will not be seeing in the Digital Harbor. Most worryingly however, these representations *animate* what Featherstone (1991) referred to as the ‘aestheticization of culture’, in particular drawing upon a racialized embodied urbanite (see Andrews & Silk, 2010), *the* ‘authentic’ black street vernacular that has been incorporated into, if not fetishized and exoticized in, the consumer capitalist order.

With a terrifying and unnerving realism, representations of an ‘authentic’ black street vernacular are also appropriated by, and mobilized in, an altogether more real pejorative Baltimore discourse—the Rodney Bethea & Skinny Suge (2004) produced documentary DVD titled *Stop Snitching*. Bethea promotes *Stop Snitching* as “a glimpse into a world politicians would rather most Baltimoreans did not see. It’s reality” (Davis 2004). In a starkly divergent discourse to official

‘destination positioning’, the documentary offers a primer on the contemporary drug scene in Baltimore, and focuses upon the signifiers of ‘success’—diamond encrusted watches, vintage Cadillac convertibles, packets of cash, and, gun paraphernalia (Witness Intimidation 2004). In part filmed in West Baltimore’s Myrtle Avenue, the neighborhood of NBA star Carmelo Anthony (who appeared in the video), and accompanied by Stop Snitching t-shirts that are for sale in “underground” shops in the city, the DVD has come under fire for its inclusion of segments in which those on camera talk openly about the harm they wish on Baltimore’s criminals who get arrested and then ‘snitch’ on those still on the street. Stop Snitching (2004) opens with a shocking and graphic warning for any drug dealer arrested who ‘snitches’:

Rattin’, man, is something that is over-popular, overpopulating the city more than AIDS, yo, know what I mean? I understand that AIDS is a real big problem and they ask you to donate money to sponsor the cure. Man, everybody should chip in and handle that because everybody knows what is going on. But, man, I want a foundation to, called “Stop Snitching in Our Communities.” I need y’all to donate to me about these bitch-ass niggas so I can educate the city about what’s going on. This is like health research, yo, this is so we can live and grow and raise our kids. Because these rats eat up everything. You feel me? So I need y’all to volunteer your information on who these punk motherfuckers is, man, so I can let the whole motherfuckin’ world know. . . All you rats lucky enough to get one of these DVDs, I hope you catch AIDS in your mouth, and your lips are the first thing to die.

The DVD provides a glimpse into the world of drugs, violence, witness intimidation, and, street culture, within certain pockets of Baltimore City. One of the key targets of the anti-witness rants is Tyree Stewart (known as Black or Blickie) who previously ran a \$50m marijuana ring. Stewart is believed to have informed on Solothal Thomas (Itchy Man) who was alleged by police to be one of the most violent enforcers in the city (Hanes 2004)ⁱⁱⁱ. Carmelo Anthony (who coincidentally, is part of Nike’s basketball family that is euphemistically promoted under the tagline “The Tie that Binds”), was

seen in the DVD hanging out on the block where he grew up, also refers to Black by name and jokes about putting a bounty on a local rapper (Davis, 2004). Anthony's cameo drew widespread disapproval, prompting him to take a newfound interest in a series of state-sponsored public service announcements that deal with violence, homicide and witness intimidation in Baltimore city (Keep Talkin 2005). Indeed, Anthony stood side-by-side with then Republican Governor Robert L. Erlich Jr. at the launch of a new anti-violence campaign in which violence is defined as the next major public health crisis facing the United States (Mosk 2005). In addition to these efforts to provide legitimacy, and indeed gain political capital for Erlich, Anthony has himself capitalized upon the publicity that emanated from his appearance in *Stop Snitching*. In September 2005, Anthony was back on Myrtle Avenue, shooting a Nike commercial for the new *Jordan Melo 5.5* sneaker. The commercial alludes to Anthony's involvement in the Stop Snitching DVD and suggestively speaks about West Baltimore's drug-war-torn Myrtle Avenue as a "Third World country on American soil" (Smith 2005). The commercial refers to Baltimore's "tough Myrtle Avenue," includes scenes involving police cars, helicopter over flights, and police spot lights, and ends with the word *B More*.^{iv} Both the City police and the mayor's office expressed concern over the commercial 'playing up' Anthony's roots, clearly recognizing the narrative differs from the 'official' discursive constitution within the externally oriented tourist tagline: "Of course we would like to see the city portrayed in a positive light. Baltimore for years was the brunt of jokes for a variety of reasons, and we've risen above that" (Mayoral spokeswoman Raquel Guillory in Smith 2005).

The Suffering: The Ties that Bind, The Wire and Anthony's *Nike* commercial are powerful public and cultural pedagogies that rub against the official destination position. Yet, they are not necessarily more 'authentic'—in terms of being generated by, and thereby being a faithful cultural representation of, those living the dystopic Baltimore experience—save perhaps for *Stop Snitching*. They essentialize race, fed as they are by reactionary historical racial fears and anxieties (compounded by a sense of illicit fascination) in which the "ghetto...continues to be the Achilles heel of American society" (Kelley 1997, 9): a demonic harbinger of social deprivation and disease, economic inertia and

indolence, cultural deprivation and resistance.” Yet, they expose that the poor hit hardest by the shift towards neoliberal urban policies—as with the racially skewed death toll of Hurricane Katrina (see Denzin 2006; McLaren & Jaramillo 2007)—are African American. Equally troubling, such rhetoric provides the basis for the ‘logics’ and ‘reactionary anxieties and fears’ of racism to manifest itself in the very fabric and architecture of ‘official’ city regulation: this has perhaps most explicitly been conspicuous in an internal campaign directed at the citizens of Baltimore, a campaign titled *Believe*.

Beyond Belief: Internal Governance and Management of Market ‘Logics’

Under the O’Malley regime, a number of policy initiatives were put in place to stabilize the murder rate (it has since fluctuated, with 2010 figures placing Baltimore as having the 4th highest rate in the country) improve the ‘quality of life’ (read zero tolerance policing policy modeled on New York, literally given that O’Malley appointed Edward Norris from the New York City police Department as Baltimore City Police Chief and utilized the Maple/Linder group who operated under Guiliani in New York) and overcome social and racial disparities in the city (Smith and Siegel 2001).^v Yet, it is the *Believe* campaign that has dominated the symbolic efforts to bring about systematic social change in Baltimore. *Believe* is a (mostly symbolic) campaign designed to transform the pessimism and cynicism in a city that had grown accustomed to drugs and tolerance of crime. Building on the perceived successes of Norris, O’Malley wanted to convince city residents to *Believe* the city could morph from its prevailing and apparently debilitating self- and popular-perceptions. In an effort to shock the population into action, and thereby light a fuse of popular will, and in a scene far more reminiscent of *The Suffering: The Ties that Bind* than the imagery within the *Get in on it* or *Bmore Happy* sloganeering, the *Believe* campaign rolled out in the spring of 2002 through a controversial television commercial of its own that also utilized local residents: a young girl with braided hair, her eyes open, lying dead in a Baltimore street, a ‘junkie’ shooting heroin in a Baltimore alley, idle ‘gangbangers’, boarded-up row houses, grade schoolers buying cocaine, filthy apartments with no front doors,

prostitutes accepting fees. At the end a single word appeared onscreen: *BELIEVE* (Kurson 2002).

O'Malley further explained the campaign:

The *Believe* campaign is about getting everyone involved. Homicides, addiction, violence, its all much *bigger than just government*. Everyone must act. We're making progress. I just got the number: Baltimore is leading America in the rate of reduction of drug-related emergency-room admissions. We're not the heroin capital anymore. We need mentors, we need people to believe. People need to know they're not alone (O'Malley in Kurson 2003, emphasis added).

O'Malley's appeal is based on a recognition that the city government requires help to transform the city—or more accurately, given the confines of neoliberal market logics, the city no longer has responsibility for such social issues, lest said social issues interfere with the utopia of free market capitalism. Thus, the *Believe* campaign appeals to Baltimore residents to “do their part”, to call “1-866-Believe to find out what you can do.” A subsequent commercial firmly placed the responsibility on the citizens of the city: “We’ve turned the corner. But until we as a community come together against drugs, we could just as easily slip back. To win, everyone has to step up and do at least one thing. Find out what you can do. *Believe* in Us. *Believe* in Yourself. Baltimore.” The commercials are supplemented by official city rhetoric that has plastered the city, bumper stickers, trash cans, and school facades with a simple, symbolic, display of the Believe campaign—the stickers in certain parts of the city have however been sardonically altered by locals to *Behave*, and, incorporating the local working class vernacular, to *B’lieve Hon*.

The campaign not only speaks to the clear message emanating from City Hall, “Believe that drugs is our city’s biggest problem. Believe we can do something about it” but also speaks to the responsibility of the community to act upon said message, “Believe that individuals and organizations have an obligation to do something about it” (Wally Pinkard, co-chair of *Believe* Campaign, in *Believe* 2003). Indeed, community ‘responsibility’ forms the core of the *Believe* mantra, declared by the city on the *Believe* website (Baltimore *Believe* 2003, emphasis added):

We believe in the people of Baltimore.

We believe Baltimore can recover from the pestilence of illegal drugs.

We believe the people of Baltimore will now *activate in themselves* the power to redeem the core identity of the city as the best place in America to live, work, and raise a family.

We believe in the future of Baltimore.

Through *Believe*, O'Malley, at least, kept the collective good on the menu. O'Malley was been blunt in garnering corporate, non-profit and individual support for his *Believe* campaign—a campaign that expanded beyond its initial narcotics focus to include a clean up of the school system and indeed certain neighborhoods—which in many ways became the mantra, if not brand identity, at least, internally, of O'Malley's tenure in Baltimore. The Mayor crossed the marked racial lines in Baltimore, reversed police lethargy, the pseudo-decriminalization of drug use, and, drug related violence that had been instantiated in the previous administrations, and attempted to make people 'care' about their surroundings, their community, and, their city. Praise subsequently rained in on the Mayor: *Esquire* magazine named him the best young Mayor in America in 2003, his political career has since developed, he has since 2006 been Governor of the State of Maryland, and, the comparisons to Bobby Kennedy are more than muted acknowledgment (Kurson 2002). He has, at the least, shaken up, or lit a fuse, in his words, under major business leaders in the city from whom he garnered support for the *Believe* campaign^{vi}. In a passionate address to the business community, he exclaimed:

its goddam unacceptable that you guys sit around here, make your money here, then go home to your suburbs and don't give a shit about these kids, our kids, who are dying . . . when a ten year old is shot in the face and we all shrug it off as casually as we would a squirrel getting run over at rush hour, I should not be the only goddam person in this city who gives a damn when the suspect is back on that same goddam street in forty eight hours . . . if this was three hundred white kids murdered in Baltimore each year, we'd have the National Guard paratrooping in here (O'Malley, in Kurson 2003).

O'Malley also, quite poignantly, attacked President George W. Bush's 2004 budget proposal for major cities and the subsequent budget acts that cut spending by 2 billion dollars, suggesting at the 2004 conference of Mayors, that these cuts, like the September 11th attacks on the metropolitan core of two major cities, were an attack on America's cities. However, while his efforts may be commendable to some, they take place within the confines of an ideological neoliberal "thought-virus" (Beck 2000, 422) in which *responsibility* is shifted from those in power to the citizen; responsibility becomes bound in garnering both corporate support and citizen involvement for crime control, for combating drug use—responsibility is less to do with democracy, social provision, or, social welfare, but is levied at public/private institutions that have little public accountability (Judd and Simpson 2003). The *Believe* campaign was also emblematic of the recent shift towards, and indeed transformations in, programs, strategies and techniques for the conduct of conduct within the neoliberal city—"rationalized and calculated interventions that have attempted to govern the existence and experience of contemporary human beings and to *act upon human conduct to direct it to certain ends*" (Rose 2000, 322, emphasis added).

Believe, as with initiatives in other cities that attempt to conduct conduct (see Silk and Andrews 2008, for an account of police initiatives in Memphis) stressed the problems (people) deemed *appropriate* to be governed, the sites within which these problems come to be defined, the diversity of authorities involved in the attempts to address them, and the technical devices that aspire to produce certain outcomes in the conduct of the governed—devices that are, in many respect, far removed from the political apparatus as traditionally conceived (Rose 2000). As Peck and Tickell (2002, 390, *emphasis added*) might surmise, *Believe* is part of the discursive armory of the new technologies of government, powerful cultural pedagogies, that are being rolled out under the rhetoric of 'reform' but operate to fashion new social subjectivities: "social and penal policy incursions [that] represent both the advancement of the neoliberal project—of extending and bolstering market logics, *socializing individualized subjects, and disciplining the noncompliant.*" In this regard,

Believe, as a reactionary rhetorical device (accompanied by popular cultural pedagogies such as *The Wire*), individualized the city's problems and potentialities, in a manner designed less to mollify citizen unrest than to 'produce' citizen conformity and docility. It is a regressive cultural pedagogy, one as distant as possible from the *official* 'colorful visual identity of a fun, carefree city,' a strategy that leads to the governance of the self and patently legitimates revanchist policing against those who are sufficiently rational not to 'believe' or 'behave.'

Taken together, official destination repositioning, public policy, and popular representations operate as powerful public and cultural pedagogies that educate specific constituents of the city with regard to their behavior in space and indeed attempts to mould and manage that behavior; they focus both on the normalized and normalizing production of self-governing productive, yet docile, individual bodies who *act* and *behave* in the interests of the market (see also Windle 2008 for a similar discussion related to demolition of 'disfunctional' urban spaces / the meanings ascribed to associated populations). Further, through making visible, productive (the creative class, tourists and consumers) and thus *responsible* citizens, those deemed in need of external governance are identified, named, problematized, and become subject to more oppressive and restrictive forms of discipline and governance. Those who have the desired—read neoliberal, consumerized—values, beliefs, and sentiments deemed to underpin the techniques of responsible self-government and the management of one's obligation to others (Rose 1999, see also Darder and Miron 2006) are called upon to act with an 'ocular authoritarianism' (Silk and Andrews 2008) that renders the abject (black, in poverty, the young, the old, the welfare recipient) citizen visible for governance. Such discourses then, not only define, and indeed rely upon, self-governance, they allow such strategies to operate at a distance from government—the responsibility to rid the streets of these 'degenerates' increasingly lies with the desired individualized subject (and indeed the governance of this desired individualized subjectivity) who is asked to aid in the moral development, education and (re)attachment of 'degenerates' to a 'virtuous', 'civilized' (consumptive-) community (Rose 1999). Hiding behind the mask of a supposedly hollowed out, or distant, state, the *Believe* campaign is a powerful pedagogic device

mobilized and instrumentalized in the name of ‘good’ citizenship, public order, and the control or elimination of criminality, delinquency, and anti-social conduct (Rose 2000). In this sense, *Believe* offers a powerful allegory, a neoliberal discourse that levies a mantra of personal responsibility and accountability through individualizing social control and governance and thereby relieving city government from civic obligation—blame is absolved away from the entrepreneurial power bloc whom are free to concentrate on securing, bolstering and extending the principles of the market—in this case, through asking citizens to “get in on” the repositioning of Baltimore. These discursive formations then can be seen as part of the silenced—yet far from absent, indeed, exceptionally present in ‘popular’ and underground representations of the city—condition of Goldberg’s (2008) ‘racial neoliberalism.’ Displaced from the formal mechanisms and regulation of government rule, such discourse is an explicit expression of race—as a social force—as it is manifest in both official and informal (popular and corporatized) domains, without being explicitly named. They reveal how race and racisms are embedded within particular public, private and corporatized structures, in which it is more ambivalent, ambiguous and difficult to identify (Goldberg 2008; 2010). In this regard, following Susan Giroux’s (2010) response to Goldberg’s (2008) *The Threat of Race*, these cultural pedagogies carry a powerful, if symbolic, sadism; they materialize cruelly at key moments to impose order and control through the production of (demonized) subjects, and provide the conditions and indeed rhetoric for the subsequent rationalization of their ill-treatment (Giroux 2010). These cultural pedagogies, then, form part of the very essence of neoliberal racism’s architecture, logics and social relations, they act as a form of symbolic isolation (cf. Giroux 2010; Goldberg 2010) that separates and partitions based on notional distinction and pre-determined difference (Goldberg 2008).

Concluding Comments

The interiorization of neoliberalism into urban policy has resulted not just in the mobilization of the city (in both material and symbolic form) as an arena for market oriented growth and elite consumption practices (tourism, place marketing, enterprise and empowerment zones, local

tax abatements, urban development corporations, public-private partnerships, property-redevelopment schemes), it has also meant new fiscal constraints and budgetary cuts on cities (due to the retrenchment of national welfare state regimes and national intergovernmental systems), and new strategies of social control, policing and surveillance (Brenner and Theodore 2002b). Indeed, while neoliberalism may have aspired to create a utopia of free markets liberated from state interference, the discursive formations, brands and policies discussed in this paper form part of a dramatic intensification of coercive, disciplinary forms of state intervention in order to impose market rule upon all aspects of social life (Brenner and Theodore 2002b; MacLeod 2002). Our argument then is that this contributes towards a neoliberalism that is not narrowly concerned with the mobilization and extension of markets (and market logics), but, and in an effort to further bolster the market, increasingly with “the political foregrounding of new modes of ‘social’ and penal policy making, concerned specifically with the aggressive regulation, disciplining, and containment of those marginalized or dispossessed (Peck and Tickell 2002, 389). In essence, the liberal-welfare city has been systematically dismantled, inhabitants are no longer entitled to basic civil liberties, social services and political rights, the working class-industrial city is (symbolically) recast through a (re-)emphasis on urban disorder, dangerous classes, and economic decline, that creates a concomitant moment of new and discriminatory forms of neoliberal racism (Goldberg, 2008) in the form of surveillance and social control (i.e. the recriminalization of poverty, the normalization of contingent work new policies to combat social exclusion by reinserting individuals into the labor market, the mobilization of zero tolerance policing, and, of entrepreneurial discourses and representations on the need for revitalization, reinvestment and rejuvenation) (Brenner and Theodore 2002b; Kearns and Paddison 2000; Peck and Tickell 2002). Such rhetoric and policy thus operate as powerful political and cultural pedagogies, a means through which city space is controlled, regulated and governed: simply put, they act to produce conditions of anti-citizenship; the anti-neoliberal citizen is produced and thus subject to regulation control and surveillance. In this way, the symbolic and discursive becomes powerful and is translated into policy, operationalized and institutionalized through mechanisms of governance

centered on neoliberal agendas, and therefore, has very real effects on city residents (Bridge and Watson 2001; MacLeod et al. 2003; Rose 2000; Silk & Andrews, 2008; Silk, 2008; 2010).

For Baltimore, questions are raised with regard to who actually is invited, or perhaps better put, discursively constituted as having the *right* to “get in on it.” Powerful cultural pedagogies (such as *Get in on It, Bmore Happy*) are inherently political, constructing a *sanctioned* public sphere and civic corpus—the *bodies proper* (Butler 1993) that fulfill the ‘obligations’ of participatory democratic citizenship (through appropriate rates and acts of consumption). However, the material and discursive visibility of these consuming, experiencing, tourist bodies serves to preserve, manage and sustain the borderlines to those who clearly *do not matter*: the socially, morally, and economically pathologized ‘outsiders’ who threaten the ‘normative universality’ of the tourist-oriented urban core (popularized through representations such as *The Wire*). These non-Believers in Baltimore become subject to ‘legitimate’ technologies of regulation, increased social surveillance and (symbolic) strategies of *control* (policing, surveillance, education, and (pseudo-)carceralization). These are ‘anti-citizens’ and marginal spaces managed through measures that seek to neutralize any dangers posed to the extension of the morphology of the neoliberal city (Silk and Andrews 2006; Silk 2010). In Baltimore then, as the urban regime becomes keyed on bolstering the logics of the market, as the state becomes more closely aligned with capital:

politics is defined largely by its policing functions rather than as an agency for peace and social reform. As the state abandons its social investments in health, education, and the public welfare, it increasingly takes on the functions of an enhanced security or police state, the signs of which are most visible in the increasing use of the state apparatus to spy on and arrest its subjects, the incarceration of individuals considered disposable (primarily poor people of color), and the ongoing criminalization of social policies (Giroux and Giroux 2006, 26).

In this way, the presence of ‘degenerate’ communities in neoliberal cityspace is not just challenged; they have become discursively constructed as problems to be addressed by specific policy measures

and the symbolic technologies of social and moral regulation (such as *Believe*) that will secure the extension, maintenance, reproduction and management of the consequences of market rule (Peck 2003; see also Devas 2001; MacLeod et. al. 2003). Put simply, there exists an uneasy juxtaposition between those served by the city as “capital space” (Harvey 2001), and those either servile to, shunned by, or simply excluded, by its over-determining consumerist logics.

Of course, given our focus on these discourses as cultural pedagogies that reveal how “culture acts as an educational force, how public education connects to other sites of pedagogy, and how identity, citizenship, and agency are organized through pedagogical relations and practices” (Giroux and Giroux 2006, 28), we recognize, and indeed call for, work that can explicate how city spaces are negotiated, enacted, performed, lived in and lived through, contested, and representative (MacLeod 2002). That is, culture, as a site of self- and social production, is where we should go to begin changing these symbolic, material and spatial relationships (Giroux 2004c; Robbins 2009). Yet, we know little of these spaces and experiences therein. Indeed, those fragments of urban space popularly represented as dystopias may actually be practiced as essential havens, transgressive lived spaces of escape, refuge, employment and entertainment (MacLeod & Ward, 2002). It is in these spaces where we, as scholars need to go, to explore how such official, mediated, and civic pedagogies are negotiated, subverted, resisted, contested, lived (see Silk, 2008; 2010). This is likely to involve telling stories, from diverse and different voices, about the contestations of space and the multiple narratives of the city, building democratic and political coalitions with excluded communities (see Edmonson 2001) challenging and (actively) disrupting the cartographic revision of the spaces of late capital, and stepping outside our comfortable zones of depersonalized and detached research into a messier world that decenters questions of power dynamics, authority, the ability to represent, and what ‘counts’ as meaningful, ethical, and, moral research (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005; see also Denzin 2002; Silk, 2008; 2010). Equally, we need to expand our understandings of the production of discourse, explicating, exposing and demystifying the veil of anonymity and mystery of the images and narratives that parade before us (Jhally, 1995) and that operate as regimes of individualized

subjectivity. Such work would offer insight into the ways in which cultural pedagogies are formed, the processes, politics and peoples who coalesce during the construction and mediation of city re-imaging, and will aid us identify whose interests are served (and thus whose are shunned). Such insights will likely move us away from an over deterministic, essentialist and reductionist vision of urban spaces as a cataclysm of neoliberalism; rather, will allow us to remember public space is “always in a process of being shaped, reshaped, and challenged by the spatial practices of various groups and individuals whose identities and actions undermine the homogeneity of contemporary cities (McCann 1999, 168 in MacLeod 2002).

Who is indeed “in on it” is thus a question that goes beyond some quirky, spurious, and indeed rather expensive identification of Baltimore’s brand DNA (to use glib marketing parlance); rather, it is a question that speaks to very real categories of inclusion and exclusion within what Brenner and Theodore (2002b) have termed ‘actually existing spaces of neoliberalism.’ To counter the repressive and racist cultural politics of neoliberalism, and indeed to avoid representing capital spaces purely as the apex of neoliberalism (MacLeod and Ward, 2002), we need multiple, pejorative, stories, pedagogies and actions (see e.g. Denzin 2002; Silk 2008; 2010): we need to begin to sketch the political project (McLaren, 2008), challenging ourselves, and perhaps most importantly, our students, to think and learn critically. We require critical pedagogies that are able to turn such representations on their head and that is not resigned to the seeming inevitability of capital (McLaren 2005). As scholars, residents, tourists, activists, in these spaces, human beings with moral, ethical, and anti-racist consciences, we need to *believe* that it is possible to produce insurgent actions and politics against the onslaught of neoliberalism and the reduction of citizenship to the privatized rituals of consumerism. As academics committed to critical pedagogy (see e.g. Darder and Miron 2006; Giroux, 2004b; 2004c; Giroux & Giroux 2006; McLaren, 2005; 2008), we need to resist, transgress and oppose, and undo these potent, public, political and purified urban pedagogies (and scholarly work that reifies such spaces). In confronting what are shrinking civil liberties and increased social injustices, it is time to ‘cross borders’ (Giroux 2001a); to abandon the comforts and calmness of our

chambers; to overcome our craven fears; and, to participate in change as we begin to imagine how the field can contribute towards advancing social justice initiatives as part of a larger struggle. Differently put, we need to realize what Peter McLaren (2005; 2008) has termed our post-capitalist futures.

References:

- Allman-Baldwin, Lysa. 2003. Ebony Escapes to Charm City. *New York Amsterdam News*, September 11, 26-34.
- Allon, Fiona. 2004. Backpacker Heaven: The Consumption and Construction of Tourist Spaces and Landscapes in Sydney. *Space & Culture* 7 (1): 49-63.
- Andrews, David L. and Michael L. Silk. 2010. Basketball's Ghetto-centric Logic. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 53 (11): 1626-1644
- Andrews, David L., Silk, Michael L. & Pitter, R. 2008. Physical Culture and the Polarized American Populous. In *Sport and Society*, ed. Barrie Houlihan, 285-304. London: Sage.
- Baltimore Believe. 2002. A Declaration of Independence from Drugs. Baltimore: City Hall. <http://www.ci.baltimore.md.us/believe/declaration.html>.
- Barrett, Paul. 2006. 'White thumbs, Black Bodies: Race, Violence and Neoliberal Fantasies in Grand Theft Auto: San Andreas'. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*. 28 (1): 95-119
- Beck, Ulrich. 2000. *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bélanger, Anouk. 2000. Sport Venues and the Spectacularization of Urban Spaces in North America: The Case of the Molson Centre in Montreal. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 35 (3): 378-397.
- Believe. 2003. *Smart CEO*, March 2003. http://www.ci.baltimore.md.us/believe/images/believe_smartceo_BLVwebsite.pdf
- Bockmeyer, Janice. 2000. A Culture of Distrust: The Impact of Local Political Culture on Participation in the Detroit EZ. *Urban Studies*, 37 (13): 2417-2440.
- Bonitz, Amy. 2003. *Bridging the Digital Divide: Building the Digital Harbor: A Smart Growth Economic Development Strategy for Baltimore*. <http://www.ci.baltimore.md.us/news/digitalharbor>
- Brenner, Neil and Nik Theodore. 2002a. Preface: From the New Localism to the Spaces of Neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 341-347.
- Brenner, Neil and Nik Theodore. 2002b. Cities and the Geographies of "Actually Existing Neoliberalism." *Antipode*, 34 (3): 349-379.
- Bridge, Gary and Sophie Watson. 2000. Retext(ur)ing the City. *City*, 5 (3): 350-362.

- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, New York and London.
- Cannon, Angie. 1999. The Charm City Blues. *U.S. News and World report*, 126 (1): 24-26.
- Cohen, Phil. 1999. In Visible Cities: Urban Regeneration and Place-Building in the Era of Multicultural Capitalism. *Communal/Plural*, 7 (1): 9-28.
- Costa, Marissa Vorraber. 2004. Teaching to Divide the World: The Perverse Curriculum of a Television Program. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 26 (2): 175-191.
- Couldry, Nick. 2008. Reality TV, or the Secret Theater of Neoliberalism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 30: (1): 3-13.
- Dao, James. 2005. Baltimore Street Meaner, but Message is Mixed. *New York Times*, February 9, A1.
- Dardor, Antonia and Luis F. Miron. 2006. Critical Pedagogy in a Time of Uncertainty. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, (6): 1, 5-20.
- Davis, Ryan. 2004. DVD's producer calls it a glimpse of reality. *Baltimore Sun*, December 29, B1.
- Davies, Mike 1990. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. London and New York: Verso.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Denzin, Norman K. 2006. Katrina and the Collapse of Civil Society in New Orleans. *Space and Culture*, (9) 1: 95-99.
- Denzin, Norman K. 2006. Confronting Ethnography's Crisis of Representation. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 31 (4): 482-489.
- Devas, Nick. 2001. Does City Governance Matter for the Urban Poor. *International Planning Studies*, 6 (4): 393-408.
- Donnell, Sharon (2010). Don't Worry, Bmore Happy: Baltimore Sells City with a Smile. *NBC Washington*. <http://www.nbcwashington.com/around-town/events/Dont-Worry-Bmore-Happy-93418229.html>
- Donovan, Dianne. 2005. Baltimore: The City in Search of a Slogan. *Baltimore Sun*, November 8, A1.
- Edmonson, Jacqueline (2001). America's Ghettos: A Pedagogy for Urban and Rural Hope. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 23 (2): 201-222.
- Fainstein, Susan and David Gladstone. 1999. Evaluating Urban Tourism. In *The Tourist City*, ed Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd, 21-34, New Haven, CT: Yale.
- Featherstone, Mike. 1991. *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books

- Friedman, Michael, David L. Andrews and Michael L. Silk. 2004. Sport and the Façade of Redevelopment in the Post-Industrial City. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21 (2): 119-139.
- Gibson, Timothy. 2005. Selling City Living: Urban Branding Campaigns, Class Power, and the Civic Good. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8 (3):, 259-280.
- Giroux, Henry A. 1994. *Disturbing Pleasures: Learning Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2000a. *Impure Acts: The Practical Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2000b. Public pedagogy as cultural politics: Stuart Hall and the 'crisis' of culture. *Cultural Studies*, 14 (2): 341-360.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2001a. Cultural studies as performative politics. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1 (1): 5-23.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2001b. Private satisfactions and public disorders: "Fight Club," patriarchy, and the politics of masculine violence. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory*, 21 (1): 1-31.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2003. *The Abandoned Generation*. New York: Palgrave.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2004a. *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2004b. Cultural studies, public pedagogy, and the responsibility of intellectuals. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 1 (1): 59-79.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2004c. Public Pedagogy and the politics of neoliberalism: Making the Political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education*. 2 (3/4): 494-503.
- Giroux, Henry A. and Susan Searls Giroux. 2006. Challenging neoliberalisms new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 6 (1): 21-32.
- Giroux, Susan Searls. 2010. Sade's Revenge: Racial Neoliberalism and the Sovereignty of Negation. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 44 (1): 1-26.
- Goldberg, David T. 2010. Call and Response. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 44 (1): 89-106.
- Goldberg, David T. 2008. *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goodwin, M. 1993. The City as Commodity: The Contested Spaces of Urban Development. In *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*, ed. Gerry Kearns and Chris Philo, 145-162. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Gottdiener, Mark. 1994. *The Social Production of Urban Space*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Gottdiener, Mark. 2000. Lefebvre and the Bias of Academic Urbanism: What can we Learn from the New Urban Analysis? *City*, 4 (1): 93-100

- Gunts, Edward. 2006. Are Ships Cramping Aquarium's Style? *Baltimore Sun*, February 12. http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-02-12/news/0602100224_1_pier-3-aquarium-in-baltimore-chermayeff
- Gunts, Edward. 2010. Find your happy place in Baltimore: Smile-themed marketing campaign to be launched. *Baltimore Sun*, May 10. http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2010-05-10/business/bs-smile-campaign-20100509_1_visit-baltimore-happy-place-oriole-bird
- Haggerty, James and Kemba Dunham. 2005. After Long Decline, Baltimore Sees New Investors Rush into Poor Neighborhoods. *The Wall Street Journal*, May 25, A1.
- Haider, Donald. 1992. Place Wars: New Realities of the 1990s. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 6 (2): 127-34.
- Hanes, Stephanie. 2004. 'Snitch' DVD is aimed at suspected ex-drug boss. *The Baltimore Sun*, December 8, A1.
- Harvey, David. 1973. *Social justice and the city*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, David. 2000. *Spaces of Hope*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press.
- Harvey, David. 2001. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, David. 2007. Neoliberalism and the City. *Studies in Social Justice*, 1 (1): 2-13.
- Hula, Richard. 1990. The Two Baltimores. In *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*, ed. Dennis Judd and Michael Parkinson, 191-215. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hurley, Lawrence. 2005. Survivors of Baltimore drug dealer attack sue for \$14M, better witness protection. *The Daily Record*, February 18, 17.
- Jameson, Frederic. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Post-Contemporary Interventions*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jamieson, Kirstie. 2004. Edinburgh: The Festival Gaze and Its Boundaries. *Space & Culture*, 7 (1): 64-75.
- Jhally, Sut. 1995. Image-based culture: Advertising and popular culture. In *Gender, race and class in media*, ed. G. Dines & J. Humez. London: Sage
- Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies. (2000). Baltimore in transition: How do we move from decline to revival? <http://www.jhu.edu/~ips/newsroom/transition.pdf>
- Judd, Dennis and Dick Simpson. 2003. Reconstructing the Local State: The Role of External Constituencies in Building Urban Tourism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46 (8): 1056-1069.
- Judd, Dennis. 1999. Constructing the Tourist Bubble. In *The Tourist City*, ed Susan Fainstein, S. and Dennis Judd, 35-53, New Haven, CT: Yale.

- Kearns, Ade and Ronan Paddison. 2000. New Challenges for Urban Governance. *Urban Studies*, 37 (5-6): 845-850.
- Keep Talkin. 2005. Editorial. *The Baltimore Sun*, May 12, A18.
- Kelley, Robin. 1997. *Yo' mama's disfunkcional!: Fighting the culture wars in urban America*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kellner, Douglas. 1995. *Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics between the Modern and the Postmodern*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kurson, Robert. 2002. The Best and the Brightest. *Esquire Magazine*, 138 (6): 150-167.
- Landor (2006). Baltimore Invites Visitors to 'Get In on It.' <http://www.landor.com/index.cfm?do=cNews.news&g=1200&storyid=460>
- Lash, Scott and John Urry. 1994. *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage.
- McLaren, Peter. 2008. This fist called my heart: Pedagogy in the belly of the beast. *Antipode*, 40 (3): 472-481.
- McLaren, Peter. 2005. Critical pedagogy and class struggle in the age of neoliberal globalization: Notes from history's underside. *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, 2 (1): 1-62.
- McLaren, Peter and Nathalia Jaramilo. 2007. Katrina and the Banshee's wall: The racialization of class exploitation. *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies*, 7 (2): 202-221.
- MacLeod, Gordon. 2002. From Urban Entrepreneurialism to a "Revanchist City"? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 602-624.
- MacLeod, Gordon and Kevin Ward. 2002. Spaces of Utopia and Dystopia: Landscaping the Contemporary City. *Geografiska Annaler*, 84B (3-4): 153-170.
- MacLeod, Gordon, Mike Raco and Kevin Ward. 2003. Negotiating the Contemporary City. *Urban Studies*, 40 (9): 1655-1671
- Morgan, Nigel and Anita Pritchard. 2005. On Souvenirs and Metonymy: Narratives of Memory, Metaphor and Materiality. *Tourist Studies*, 5 (1): 29-53.
- Mosk, Matthew. 2005. PR Efforts in Md. Targets Violence, NBA Player in Erlich Initiative. *The Washington Post*, May 12, B6.
- O'Malley, Martin. 2000. *Leadership in the New Economy*. Mayoral Speeches. <http://www.ci.baltimore.md.us/mayor/speeches/sp000714.html>
- Ollison, Rashod and Steven Kiehl. 2005. City gets a bad rap in song by 50 Cent: Baltimore is in title of a cut about heroin. *Baltimore Sun*, March 5, D1.
- Pagano, Michael and Ann Bowman. 1995.. *Cityscapes and Capital: The Politics of Urban Development*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Peck, Jamie and Adam Tickell. 2002. Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 380-403.

- Peck, Jamie. 2003. Geography and Public Policy: Mapping the Penal State. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27 (2): 222-232.
- Protesters Fault Mayor in Fire that Killed Six in Baltimore. 2005. *New York Times*, October 21, A10.
- Robbins, Christopher G. 2009. Searching for politics with Henry Giroux: Through cultural studies, public pedagogy and the “terror of neoliberalism.” *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 31 (5): 428-478.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. Community, Citizenship, and the Third Way. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43 (9): 1395-1411.
- Rose, Nikolas. 2000. Government and Control. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40 (2): 321-339.
- Rowe, David and Pauline McGuirk. 1999. ‘Drunk for Three Weeks: Sporting Success and the City Image’, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 34 (1): 125-42.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2001. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (2nd Edition). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sheller, Mimi and John Urry. 2003. Mobile Transformations of Public and Private Life. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20 (3): 107-125.
- Siegel, Fred and Van Smith. 2001. Can Mayor O’Malley save Ailing Baltimore? *City Journal*, 11 (1): 64-75.
- Silk, Michael L. 2004. A Tale of Two Cities: Spaces of Consumption & the Façade of Cultural Development, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 28 (4): 349-378.
- Silk, Michael L. 2007. ‘Come Downtown & Play.’ *Leisure Studies*, 26 (3): 253-277.
- Silk, Michael L. 2008. Mow My Lawn. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 8, (4): 477-478.
- Silk, Michael L. 2010. Postcards from Pigtown. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 10 (2): 143-156.
- Silk, Michael L. and John Amis. 2005. Sport Tourism, Cityscapes and Cultural Politics. *Sport in Society*, 8 (2): 280-301.
- Silk, Michael L. and David L. Andrews. 2006. The Fittest City in America. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 30 (3): 1-13
- Silk, Michael L. & David L. Andrews. 2008. Managing Memphis: Governance and Spaces of Inequality. *Social Identities*, 14 (3): 395-414.
- Smith, Neil. 1998. Giuliani Time: The Revanchist 1990s. *Social Text*, 57 (1): 1-20.
- Smith, Van. 2005. Shoe Shot: Police Dis Sneaker Ad in West Baltimore. *City Paper*, September 28.. <http://www.citypaper.com/news/story.asp?id=10931>
- Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies*. New York: Verso.

- Tucker, Abigail. 2005. Harm City: Three Men Familiar with the City's Crime and Grime take on a Virtual Baltimore via a new Video Game. *The Baltimore Sun*, 11 October, 1E.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2004. *Population and Housing Narrative Profile*. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/NPTable?_ame=ACS_2004_EST_G00_NPO1
- Visit Baltimore. 2006. *The Brand*. <http://www.areyouinonit.com/thebrand.php>
- Wagner, Richard. 1996. The Construction of Urban Tourism Space: Baltimore's Inner Harbor, 1964-1990. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Waitt, Gordon. 1999. Playing Games with Sydney: Marketing Sydney for the 2000 Olympics. *Urban Studies*, 36 (7): 1062-1073.
- Walks, R. Alan. 2001. The Social Ecology of the Post-Fordist/Global City? Economic Restructuring and Socio-Spatial Polarisation in the Toronto Urban Regional. *Urban Studies*, 38 (3): 407-447.
- Wilcox, Ralph and David L. Andrews, D. 2003. Sport in the City: Cultural, Economic and Political Portraits. In *Sporting Dystopias: The Making and Meanings of Urban Sport Cultures*, ed. Ralph Wilcox, David L. Andrews, Rob Pitter and Richard Irwin, 1-16. New York: SUNY Press
- Windle, Joel (2008). In Remembrance of Things Past? Strategies of Public Pedagogy for Urban "Renovation". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 30 (5): 377-398.
- Witness Intimidation. 2004. *The Baltimore Sun*. December 9, 26A.
- Zylinska, Joanna. 2004. The Universal Acts: Judith Butler and the Biopolitics of Immigration. *Cultural Studies*, 18 (4): 523-537.

ⁱ The city does have full and rich African American histories. With the exception however of the recently opened Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland African American History and Culture, these histories do not tend to feature heavily in the city's promotional campaigns—although the recent comprehensive master plan does recognize the supposed \$90 billion potential in 'minority tourism'. For a discussion of African American history in Baltimore, see Allman-Baldwin (2003).

ⁱⁱ These representations have, in particularly the Wire, sparked what is a peculiar fascination that the British broadsheet media/intelligentsia/chattering classes seem to have with the fetishizing of Blackness / black urban "authenticity." Undeniably popular, in Stuart Hall's sense of the word, yet we wonder if consumption of the Wire is more an exoticizing or eroticizing of the urban Other through a lens almost reminiscent of traditional "colonialist" anthropology. While beyond the scope of this paper, there are a number of academic texts that explicitly address the cultural politics of the Wire, such as Potter and Marshall's (2009), *The Wire: Urban Decay and American Television*.

ⁱⁱⁱ As a direct response, the Baltimore Police Department produced its own 4 minute DVD titled, *Keep Talkin*. Employing the same distinctly black, urban, hip-hop, "street" aesthetic as *Stop Snitching*, *Keep Talkin* encourages residents to keep reporting criminal activities in their neighborhood.

^{iv} For a paper length explication of Anthony's 'embodied urbanite', see Andrews & Silk (2010).

^v This was however a relatively brief appointment as in 2003, he left the Baltimore City force under a cloud of expense account indictment threats. He joined the State force, but Federal indictments issued in 2003 lead to a guilty plea to two counts related to spending from a Baltimore Police Department "supplemental" fund on items that were for personal use rather than for police-related activities. He served six months in various federal prison camps and continues to serve home detention because of a plea bargain with the U.S. Attorney's Office in May 2004.

^{vi} This distance, the lack of public accountability, has however been challenged in Baltimore as a result of an extremely horrific, high profile, and tragic incident that points to the shortcomings of the shifts away from

welfare capitalism. Within the spirit of the *Believe* campaign, Angela Dawson, of Oliver, North East Baltimore, and her husband, Carnell, stepped forward to work with the city of Baltimore against the drug dealers in their neighborhood. From July to October 2002, Angela Dawson called the police more than 50 times. After several incidents in which they were intimidated by local drug dealers in their East Baltimore neighborhood, including an attempted firebombing, the Dawson's house was broken into, accelerant distributed throughout the living rooms, and set on fire on October 16th 2002. Angela, Carnell and their 5 children, 9-year-old twins Keith and Kevin, Carnell Jr., 10, Juan Ortiz, 12, and LaWanda Ortiz, 14, were all killed. Darrel L. Brooks, a known drug dealer, was sentenced to life without parole for the offence. The relatives of the seven members of the Dawson family killed in the arson attack have filed suit against the city, state and various agencies, claiming not enough was done to prevent the tragedy (Hurley, 2005). The suit alleges that the *Believe* campaign, which encourages residents to come forward with information about drug dealers, only served to contribute to the problem because law enforcement did not provide resources to protect witnesses. The suit alleges that the *Believe* campaign was launched at a time when it was known that witness intimidation was commonplace and critiques the administration for a focus on a high-priced symbolic campaign at the expense of witness protection provision (Hurley, 2005).